



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/620,567	07/15/2003	Takeshi Arisaka	16869S-085300US	9259
20350 7590 06/20/2007 TOWNSEND AND TOWNSEND AND CREW, LLP TWO EMBARCADERO CENTER EIGHTH FLOOR SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111-3834			EXAMINER JOHNSON, CARLTON	
			ART UNIT 2136	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 06/20/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/620,567

Applicant(s)

ARISAKA ET AL.

Examiner

Carlton V. Johnson

Art Unit

2136

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 April 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responding to application papers filed on **4-12-2007**.
2. Claims **1 - 10** are pending. Claims **1, 9** have been amended. Claims **1, 9** are independent.

Response to Remarks

- 3 The following is in response to remarks dated 4-12-2007.

3.1 Applicant argues, the referenced prior art does not disclose the generation (packaging) and the transmission of two sets of document data, and the un-packaging of the two sets of document data. (see Remarks Pages 6, 7)

The Altomare prior art discloses a transaction that contains multiple sets of document data (see Altomare paragraph [0164], lines 6-7; paragraph [0165], lines 1-6: transaction, multiple sets of document data), and the transfer of the transaction data and the processing of the transferred transaction data at the receiving end (see Altomare paragraph [0179], lines 4-7; data processed). The Altomare prior art discloses that the data to be transferred is encrypted. There is no disclosure that all of the document data for a transmission is encrypted only the indicated portions (or all) of the document data to be encrypted. (see Altomare paragraph [0104], lines 7-8).

The amendment of the term "*package*" within the claim limitations, and its replacement with the term "*parcel*" does not change the meaning of the claim limitation.

Art Unit: 2136

A "parcel" is defined as, " ... *Something wrapped up or packaged; a package.* ... ". A parcel is equivalent to a package. (<http://www.answers.com/topic/parcel>)

Therefore, the previous citations disclose the claim limitations.

The specification discloses the transmission of document data such as original document data and document difference data. The difference data is utilized to transform the original document data into a final state for the document. The Altomare prior art discloses the generation and processing of difference data and designates it as useful data. The Altomare prior art discloses the transfer of multiple sets of document data in a single transaction or transmission.

The referenced prior art discloses the claim limitations.

3.2 Applicant argues, the referenced prior art discloses both encryption and compression. (see Remarks Page 6)

Data compression is a claim limitation in claims 3, 4, 7, 8. In the claim limitations that only designate encryption, the document data is still encrypted. The fact that the data is also compressed does not eliminate the disclosure that the document data is encrypted as per claim limitation. The Altomare prior art discloses encryption. (see Altomare paragraph [0104], lines 1-8; paragraph [0107], lines 1-3: encryption capability for transferred data)

3.3 The examiner has considered the applicant's remarks concerning an electronic commerce system utilizing template data whereby a sending processor encrypts original

Art Unit: 2136

information, generates difference information, and packages the encrypted original information and the difference information. And, whereby a receiving processor unpackages received data, restores the original information from the difference information and the template data, decrypts encrypted data. Applicant's arguments have thus been fully analyzed and considered but they are not persuasive.

After an additional analysis of the applicant's invention, remarks, and a search of the available prior art, it was determined that the current set of prior art consisting of Altomare (20030033159), Lash (6,912,591), and Feldbau (6,182,219) discloses the applicant's invention including disclosures in Remarks dated April 12, 2007.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102(e) that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

5. Claims **1, 4, 9** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by **Altomare et al. (US PG PUB No. 20030033159)**.

Regarding Claim 1, Altomare discloses an electronic commerce method for sending and receiving an electronic document between two or more information processors connected via a network, said method comprising the steps of:

- a) encrypting electronic document data, processing the electronic document data after the encrypting step, packaging the encrypted electronic document data and the processed electronic document data as a parcel comprising both the encrypted electronic document data and the processed electronic document data, and sending the parcel by an electronic-document sending processor; (see Altomare paragraph [0009], lines 4-10: two network interconnected systems (i.e. processors); paragraph [0011], lines 6-8: document data processed to terminal (i.e. send); paragraph [0031], lines 8-12: process, package and send document data; paragraph [0104], lines 1-8; paragraph [0107], lines 1-3: encryption capability for transferred data; paragraph [0164], lines 6-7; paragraph [0165], lines 1-6: transaction, multiple sets of document data transferred) and
- b) un-packaging received parcel into processed electronic document data and encrypted electronic document data, restoring the processed electronic document data, decrypting the encrypted electronic document data, and checking whether the restored electronic document data matches the decrypted electronic document data by an electronic-document receiving processor. (see Altomare paragraph [0011], lines 6-8; paragraph [0031], lines 8-12: receive, process, un-package document data from terminal (receive); paragraph [0104], lines 1-8; paragraph [0107], lines 1-3: encryption capability for transferred data)

Regarding Claim 4, Altomare discloses the electronic commerce method according to claim 1,

- a) wherein, when the electronic document data is processed, said electronic-document sending processor compresses the electronic document data (see Altomare paragraph [0011], lines 6-8: interface module (i.e. sender), data sending; paragraph [0106], lines 1-2; paragraph [0107], lines 1-3: compression capability for document data) and
- b) wherein, when the processed electronic document data is restored, said electronic-document receiving processor decompresses the compressed electronic document data. (see Altomare paragraph [0011], lines 6-8: interface module (i.e. receiver), data receiving; paragraph [0107], lines 1-3: compression/decompression capability for document data)

Regarding Claim 9, Altomare discloses an electronic commerce system for sending and receiving an electronic document between two or more information processors connected via a network

- a) wherein an electronic-document sending processor comprises means for encrypting electronic document data; means for processing the electronic document data; means for packaging the encrypted electronic document data and the processed electronic document data as a parcel comprising both encrypted electronic document data and processed electronic document data;

and means for sending the parcel; (see Altomare paragraph [0021], lines 1-3; paragraph [0030], lines 1-3: software implementation means; paragraph [0011], lines 6-8: interface module (i.e. sender), data sending; paragraph [0031], lines 8-12: process, package, and send document data; paragraph [0104], lines 1-8; paragraph [0107], lines 1-3: encryption capability for document data; paragraph [0164], lines 6-7; paragraph [0165], lines 1-6: transaction, multiple sets of document data transferred) and

- b) wherein an electronic-document receiving processor comprises means for un-packaging received parcel into processed electronic document data and encrypted electronic document data; means for restoring the processed electronic document data; means for decrypting the encrypted electronic document data; and means for checking whether the restored electronic document data matches the decrypted electronic document data. (see Altomare paragraph [0021], lines 1-3; paragraph [0030], lines 1-3: software implementation and means; paragraph [0011], lines 6-8: interface module (i.e. receiver), data receiving; paragraph [0031], lines 8-12: receive, un-package, and process document data; paragraph [0104], lines 1-8; paragraph [0107], lines 1-3: decryption capability for document data)

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Art Unit: 2136

a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims **2, 3, 10** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Altomare** in view of **Lash** (US Patent No. **6,912,591**).

Regarding Claim 2, Altomare discloses the electronic commerce method according to claim 1.

And, Altomare discloses wherein a template wherein template data common to at least two processors (see Altomare paragraph [0009], lines 4-10: two network interconnected systems (i.e. processors)) is provided, wherein, when the electronic document data is processed, said electronic-document sending processor. (see Altomare paragraph [0011], lines 1-3; paragraph [0031], lines 8-13: document data processing system) Altomare does not specifically disclose the capability to extract difference information between the electronic document data and the template data. However, Lash discloses:

- a) wherein extract difference information between the electronic document data and the template data. (see Lash col. 6, lines 25-27: generate difference information between two sets of data (i.e. document data))
- b) wherein, when the processed electronic document data is restored, said electronic-document receiving processor combines the template data and the difference information. (see Lash col. 5, lines 6-8; col. 4, lines 61-62: update (i.e.

Art Unit: 2136

current data) with difference information to obtain updated data (i.e. document data))

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Altomare as taught by Lash to enable the capability for the generation, transmission, and recombination of difference information between a current set and an updated set of digital data. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to employ the teachings of Lash in order to optimize and efficiently utilize bandwidth along the transmission medium. (see Lash col. 1, lines 9-13: "*... using existing infrastructure so that "difference" information can be sent to an application rather than a complete updated data set, therefore increasing the effective bandwidth along the transmission medium/channel. ...*")

Regarding Claim 3, Altomare discloses the electronic commerce method according to claim 2.

Altomare discloses wherein when the electronic document data information is compressed and then decompressed. (see Altomare paragraph [0031], lines 8-12: document processing system; paragraph [0107], lines 1-3: compression and decompression capability for document data) Altomare does not specifically disclose the processing of difference information.

However, Lash discloses:

- a) wherein, when the electronic document data is processed with difference information (see Lash col. 6, lines 25-27; col. 5, lines 6-8: difference information) and
- b) wherein, when the electronic document data is restored with difference information. (see Lash col. 6, lines 25-27; col. 5, lines 6-8: updated document data using difference information)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Altomare as taught by Lash to enable the capability for the generation, transmission, and recombination of difference information between a current set and an updated set of digital data. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to employ the teachings of Lash in order to optimize and efficiently utilize bandwidth along the transmission medium. (see Lash col. 1, lines 9-13)

Regarding Claim 10, Altomare discloses the electronic commerce system according to claim 9.

And, Altomare discloses wherein template data common to at least two processors (see Altomare paragraph [0009], lines 4-10: two network interconnected systems (i.e. processors)) is provided, wherein said electronic-document sending processor means, and wherein said electronic-document receiving processor means. (see Altomare paragraph [0021], lines 1-3; paragraph [0030], lines 1-3: software implementation means; paragraph [0031], lines 8-12: document processing system) Altomare does not specifically disclose extracting difference information between the

electronic document data and the template data for use when the electronic document data is processed, and combining the template data and the difference information for use when the processed electronic document data is restored.

However, Lash discloses:

- a) wherein extracting difference information between the electronic document data and the template data for use when the electronic document data is processed, (see Lash col. 6, lines 25-27; col. 5, lines 6-8: process difference information) and
- b) wherein combining the template data and the difference information for use when the processed electronic document data is restored. (see Lash col. 6, lines 25-27; col. 5, lines 6-8: updated document data using difference information)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Altomare as taught by Lash to enable the capability to enable the capability for the generation, transmission, and recombination of difference information between a current set and an updated set of digital data. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to employ the teachings of Lash in order to optimize and efficiently utilize bandwidth along the transmission medium. (see Lash col. 1, lines 9-13)

8. Claims **5, 8** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Altomare** in view of **Feldbau et al.** (US Patent No. **6,182,219**).

Regarding Claim 5, Altomare discloses the electronic commerce method according to claim 1.

And, Altomare discloses wherein the electronic document data is encrypted (see Altomare paragraph [0104], lines 1-8; paragraph [0107], lines 1-3: encryption capability for transferred data), and when whether the restored electronic document data matches the decrypted electronic document data is checked. (see Altomare paragraph [0104], lines 1-8; paragraph [0107], lines 1-3: encryption capability for transferred data; paragraph [0043], lines 1-3: error detection, data match determination) Altomare does not specifically disclose wherein a message digest of the electronic document data is calculated, and whether the restored electronic document data matches the decrypted electronic document data is checked, a message digest of the restored electronic document data is calculated and whether the calculated message digest matches the decrypted message digest is checked.

However, Feldbau discloses:

- a) wherein the message digest of the electronic document data. (see Feldbau col. 10, lines 19-25; col. 15, lines 20-29; col. 10, lines 39-46; col. 14, line 58 - col. 15, line 7: digital signature processing capability for authentication) and
- b) wherein a message digest of the restored electronic document data is calculated and whether the calculated message digest matches the decrypted message digest is checked. (see Feldbau col. 10, lines 19-25; col. 15, lines 20-29; col. 10, lines 39-46; col. 14, line 58 - col. 15, line 7: digital signature processing capability for authentication)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Altomare as taught by Feldbau to enable the capability to utilize a digest or a digital signature in document data processing. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to employ the teachings of Feldbau in order to enable a convenient method for authenticating the dispatch and contents of documents, and other type of electronic information. (see Feldbau col. 2, lines 52-56: “ ... *a need for a method and system to provide the sender with a convenient means for authenticating both the dispatch and the contents of documents, electronic information and other information during the normal flow of daily activities.* ... ”)

Regarding Claim 8, Altomare discloses the electronic commerce method according to claim 5,

- a) wherein, when the electronic document data is processed, said electronic-document sending processor compresses the electronic document data (see Altomare paragraph [0031], lines 8-12: electronic data processed; paragraph [0031], lines 6-8: document data transferred; paragraph [0107], lines 1-3: compression and decompression capability for document data) and
- b) wherein, when the processed electronic document data is restored, said electronic-document receiving processor decompresses the compressed electronic document data. (see Altomare paragraph [0031], lines 8-12: electronic data processed; paragraph [0031], lines 6-8: document data transferred;

Art Unit: 2136

paragraph [0107], lines 1-3: compression and decompression capability for document data)

9. Claims **6, 7** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Altomare-Feldbau** and further in view of **Lash**.

Regarding Claim 6, Altomare discloses the electronic commerce method according to claim 5.

And, Altomare discloses wherein template data common to at least two processors (see Altomare paragraph [0009], lines 4-10: two network interconnected systems (i.e. processors)) is provided, wherein, when the electronic document data is processed, said electronic-document sending processor, and when the processed electronic document data is restored, said electronic-document receiving processor combines the template data and the difference information. (see Altomare paragraph [0021], lines 1-3; paragraph [0030], lines 1-3: software implementation means; paragraph [0031], lines 8-12: document processing system) Altomare does not specifically disclose extracting difference information between the electronic document data and the template data, and combining the template data and the difference information.

However, Lash discloses:

Art Unit: 2136

- a) wherein processor extracts difference information between the electronic document data and the template data (see Lash col. 6, lines 25-27; col. 5, lines 6-8: difference information)
- b) wherein, processor combines the template data and the difference information. (see Lash col. 6, lines 25-27; col. 5, lines 6-8: updated document data using difference information)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Altomare as taught by Lash to enable the capability to enable the capability for the generation, transmission, and recombination of difference information between a current set and an updated set of digital data. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to employ the teachings of Lash in order to optimize and efficiently utilize bandwidth along the transmission medium. (see Lash col. 1, lines 9-13)

Regarding Claim 7, Altomare discloses the electronic commerce method according to claim 6.

And, Altomare discloses wherein, when the electronic document data is processed, the information is compressed, and when the processed electronic document data is restored, the compressed information is decompressed. (see Altomare paragraph [0031], lines 8-12: document data processed; paragraph [0107], lines 1-3: compression and decompression capability for document data)

- a) wherein, the processed electronic document data is difference information (see Lash col. 6, lines 25-27: generate difference information between two sets of data (i.e. document data)) and
- b) wherein, the processed electronic document data is restored, is difference information. (see Lash col. 5, lines 6-8; col. 4, lines 61-62: update (i.e. current data) with difference information to obtain updated data (i.e. document data))

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Altomare as taught by Lash to enable the capability to enable the capability for the generation, transmission, and recombination of difference information between a current set and an updated set of digital data. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to employ the teachings of Lash in order to optimize and efficiently utilize bandwidth along the transmission medium. (see Lash col. 1, lines 9-13)

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the

Art Unit: 2136

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Carlton V. Johnson whose telephone number is 571-270-1032. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Friday , 8:00 - 5:00PM EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nasser Moazzami can be reached on 571-272-4195. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Carlton V. Johnson

Application/Control Number: 10/620,567

Page 18

Art Unit: 2136

C. J.
CVJ

June 11, 2007

Examiner
Art Unit 2136

NASSER MOAZZAMI
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

[Signature]
6,13,07